

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tribute to Robert E. Lee by Senator  
Sparkman.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, today at the ceremony held in Statutory Hall I had the pleasure of delivering an address in tribute to Gen. Robert E. Lee. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN AT CEREMONIES HONORING ROBERT E. LEE, STATUTORY HALL, JANUARY 19, 1956

I am deeply honored to join you today in tribute to a great American.

To me the life of Robert E. Lee has always been an inspiration and a challenge. Our history holds no counterpart to the story of Lee. He was by his own appraisal, a failure. Some historians agree that his record was one of failure. If this be true he was the most magnificent failure of all time. For where will you find a life more sublime in its devotion to duty, more inspiring in its reverence of Almighty God, or so grand in its hour of defeat?

The star that guided the career of Robert E. Lee grows brighter with each passing year. So it is with all of the truly great. Today we see in retrospect many facets of Lee's lonely existence which were obscured by the prejudices and the mores of the early postwar years.

In my early schooldays Lee was almost a legendary figure. Some of you, perhaps, will recall that Historian Long declared: "Throughout his whole student life, he performed no act which his pious mother could not have fully approved;" or the words of an old teacher: "He was never behind time at his studies, never failed in a single recitation, was perfectly observant of the rules and regulations of the institution." We can all rejoice that such legendary acclaim has been dispelled. Lee's own letters reveal him as a warm, compassionate man with many of the frailties of mankind.

Still later, we have Lee presented as a man of mystery. His letters and his words, we are told, are couched in formality and carefully conceal his innermost desires or his true nature.

He was by his own admission like his daughter, "always wanting something"—but what? Again, we are given the picture of a lifelong conflict of conscience with the realities of his existence.

Lee deprecated war. He opposed secession, yet with all of the great ability he possessed sought to defend this right of the States. He owned slaves, yet he opposed slavery and freed those he owned long before the war. He was a soldier of the United States, a graduate of the West Point Academy, and a former superintendent of the Academy. Yet his sense of duty, or honor if you please, called him to the defense of his native Virginia. He was devoted to his home and to his family. Fate decreed that much of his life should be spent away from both.

These are serious contradictions. But to me they are not difficult to understand. Lee's life was a pattern of rigid discipline. His religion—he was an Episcopalian—was its dominating influence. Through every deed and word runs the theme of "Let mankind do what man can and must do—God will take care of the rest."

Lee was born January 19, 1807, in Stratford, Va. He was the son of "Light Horse Harry" Lee and Anne Hill Carter Lee. Light Horse Harry served with Washington in the Revolutionary War. Robert E. Lee's father died when Robert was 11 years old.

The Lees moved to Alexandria in 1811 to educate their children.

Unfortunately, very little is known about the childhood or the early education of Robert E. Lee. His first teacher was a Mr. Leary. He later attended the school of Benjamin Hallowell where his time was devoted chiefly to mathematics. He was an exemplary student.

Lee entered West Point when he was 18 years old. He was a good scholar. He graduated high in his class in 1829, and received an appointment in the Engineering Corps.

For some years he was stationed at Old Point Comfort. While there he married Miss Mary Custis, the great-granddaughter of Mrs. Washington. This took place in Arlington in June 1831. Through this marriage, Lee came into control of extensive property—farms, mansions, and a considerable number of slaves.

In the years before the Mexican War, Lee was stationed in various parts of the country, pursuing his profession as a military engineer. He was sent to Ohio to adjust the boundaries of that State with Michigan. Later he supervised the defenses of New York harbor. In St. Louis he worked to control the course of the Mississippi River.

In the Mexican War he began as captain under General Wood. He took part in the battle of Buena Vista. He participated in the siege of Vera Cruz. His promotion was rapid. He was made a major at Cerro Gorda, a lieutenant colonel at Contreras, and a colonel at Chapultepec. He was slightly wounded at Chapultepec.

There is evidence that he displayed great courage and resourcefulness throughout the war. For this he received high commendation from General Scott who also was a Virginian.

After the Mexican War Lee resumed his engineering work in various parts of the country. For some time he was engaged in construction of a fort at Baltimore.

In 1852, at the age of 45, he was made Superintendent of the West Point Academy. He accepted with regret because he feared he could not measure up to the expectations of the Secretary of War. It was his feeling that the job required "more skill and experience" than he possessed. Lee improved the discipline and the courses of study at West Point.

In 1855, Lee left West Point for a lieutenant colonelcy in one of the new cavalry regiments. His service with the cavalry was in the Western and Southwestern States while his family remained at Arlington.

Now the war clouds were gathering. Lee wrote that he hoped President Buchanan would "be able to extinguish fanaticism between North and South, cultivate love for the country and Union, and restore harmony between the different sections."

In October 1859, while on furlough at Arlington, Lee was ordered to arrest John Brown. He discharged his duty in a quiet and efficient manner, as witness his report:

"Tuesday, about sunrise, with twelve marines under the command of Lieutenant Green, broke in the door of the engine-house, secured the robbers, and released all of the (Southern) prisoners unhurt."

Brown was turned over to the civil authorities. "I am glad we did not have to kill him," Lee remarked afterward, "for I believe he is an honest, conscientious old man."

The year 1861 was the year of the great decision. Lee was 54. "As far as I can judge from the papers," he wrote, "we are between a state of anarchy and civil war. May God avert us from both . . . I must try and be patient and await the end for I can do nothing to hasten or retard it."

Lee had previously expressed his resentment of the North's aggression and "denial of equal rights of our citizens to the common territory of the Commonwealth" and his displeasure with the course of the "Cotton States" which he termed "selfish and dictatorial."

"While I wish to do what is right," he said, "I am unwilling to do what is wrong at the bidding of the South or the North."

Lee's account of the interview with Francis P. Blair in which he was offered and declined the command of the United States Army, is well known.

In this account he said: "I never intimated to anyone that I desired the command of the United States Army, nor did I ever have a conversation with but one gentleman, the Honorable Francis P. Blair, on the subject, which was at his invitation and, as I understood, at the instance of President Lincoln. After listening to his remarks, I declined the offer he made me to take command of the army that was to be brought into the field, stating as candidly and courteously as I could that though opposed to secession and deprecating war I could take no part in an invasion of the Southern States."

This interview occurred on April 18. Lee went immediately to tell General Scott of the proposition that had been made to him, and of his decision. Some historians are convinced that General Townsend's eyewitness account of the talk with General Scott is substantially incorrect, because it makes no mention of Lee's report on the proposition submitted by Blair. In the Townsend report, Lee is quoted as saying: "The property belonging to my children, all they possess, lies in Virginia. They will be ruined if they do not go with their State. I cannot raise my hand against my children."

Townsend said this interview took place on April 19. Lee gave the date as April 18.

Two days later Lee sent his letter of resignation to General Scott saying that "Save in the defense of my native State, I never desire again to draw my sword."

It is significant that Lee clung to the Union up to the hour of Virginia's decision to secede.

In January 1861, he wrote: "I can anticipate no greater calamity for the country than a dissolution of the Union. It would be an accumulation of all the evils we complain of, and I am willing to sacrifice everything but honor for its preservation. \* \* \* Secession is nothing but revolution."

I think we have to consider that Lee had a profound regard for the sovereignty and rights of the States, as expressed by Jefferson and opposed by the Hamiltonian theory. Lee's father had served as Governor of Virginia. Two of his kinsmen, Richard and Francis Lee, signed the Declaration of Independence. A third, Thomas Lee, was President and Commander in Chief of Virginia. The Constitution and the rights reserved for



the States were sacred to Lee. Lee felt that he was fighting, not for slavery, but for the preservation of all of the other constitutional powers of the States.

"I had no guide," he said, "nor had I any other object than the defense of those principles of American liberty upon which the constitutions of the several States were originally founded; and unless they are strictly observed, I fear there will be an end to Republican Government in this country. \* \* \*

Again he declares, "All that the South has ever desired was that the Union, as established by our forefathers, should be preserved, and that the Government as originally organized should be administered in purity and truth."

Then followed the four years of brilliant campaigns that proved him one of the greatest strategists of all time—four years of privation with an ill-clad and hungry army—a heart-breaking struggle ending at Appomattox. "A Caesar without his ambition; a Frederick without his tyranny; a Napoleon without his selfishness; and a Washington without his reward."

It is recorded that no general was more greatly beloved by his men.

In all the storm of criticism toward the close of the War, Lee steadfastly declined to "assume responsibilities or make decisions that were properly those of President Davis or other civil authorities."

If Lee was great in battle, he was grand in defeat. In all of his career, Lee had been resolute and forward-looking in every deed and decision. Now he called upon the people of the South to unite in the restoration of the country and the re-establishment of peace and harmony. For himself all he desired was "some little quiet home in the woods, where I can procure shelter and my daily bread, if permitted by the victor."

He considered himself a citizen of a united country, although his plea for amnesty was never formally granted. He turned a deaf ear to all offers by commercial enterprises for use of his name, declaring: "My name is not for sale."

In August 1865, he accepted the Presidency of Washington College—a school with 40 students and four professors. The college prospered during the 5 years of Lee's tenure. Lee seemed to relish this, saying:

"For my own part, I much enjoy the charms of civil life and find too late that I have wasted the best part of my existence."

Here ended the career of Robert E. Lee. He died on October 12, 1870. He was buried at Lexington in a chapel erected by his efforts.

Lee regarded his life as a failure. Shortly before his death he wrote:

"Life is indeed gliding away and I have nothing of good to show for mine that is past. I pray I may be spared to accomplish something for the benefit of mankind and the honor of God."

It is singular to note that Bradford, a distinguished historian, agrees that Lee's life will always be regarded as a record of failure. He says that success is the idol of the world and the world's idols have been successful.

From Lee's pen we have his assertion that "human virtue should be equal to human calamity." From his own life we have proof that this can be true.

Only recently William Faulkner observed that we are all failures to the extent that we can never achieve all we have hoped to achieve.

And on this subject of failure, let me quote from the great jurist, Learned Hand:

"By some happy fortuity man is a projector, a designer, a builder, a craftsman; it is among his most dependable joys to impose upon the flux that passes before him some mark of himself, aware though he always must be of the odds against him.

"His reward is not so much in the work as in its making; not so much in the prize as in the race. We may win when we lose, if we have done what we can; for by so doing we have made real at least some part of that finished product in whose fabrication we are most concerned—ourselves."

Robert E. Lee a failure. If so, let me say again that he was history's most magnificent failure.

When we think of the influence that he has had down through the years on the people of his own generation and on those who came after him, not only in Virginia, not only throughout the South, but all over this Nation, what more could one have done toward succeeding?

I mentioned above that the historian Bradford considered Lee a failure. Yet it is my understanding that even the study of Lee had a tremendous influence upon Bradford. I have been told that he started his work on the subject, "Lee, the Rebel"; that as he studied Lee's direction of the armed forces of the Confederacy he changed his title to "Lee, the Soldier"; that as he studied Lee's life and influence and his personal conduct following the end of the war he ended up with the title under which his book is published: "Lee, the American."

It is interesting to note the closing paragraph of Bradford's appendix to "Lee, the American."

"It is an advantage to have a subject like Lee that one cannot help loving. I say, cannot help. The language of some of his adorers tends at first to breed a feeling contrary to love. Persist and make your way through this and you will find a human being as lovable as any that ever lived. At least I have. I have loved him, and I may say that his influence upon my own life, though I came to him late, has been as deep and as inspiring as any I have ever known. If I convey but a little of that influence to others who will feel it as I have, I shall be more than satisfied."

Robert E. Lee will ever live in the hearts of Americans everywhere as a great American.

### Tax on Gasoline Used by Farmers

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to refund the 2-cents-a-gallon tax on gasoline used by farmers for nonhighway use. This tax is an unnecessary and unwarranted burden on the farmers of this Nation.

Farmers should be expected to pay the same taxes as others on the gasoline and lubricating oil they use to travel public roads and streets. There is little justification, however, for extracting this tax from them for gasoline and oil used to power the vehicles and instruments of modern farm production. This tax is a significant item to many farmers, and should have been set aside long ago. It is all the more worthy at this time when so many farmers are caught in the squeeze between higher costs of production and lower prices for their products.

Other Congressmen have introduced legislation for this purpose, and the Ways and Means Committee is presently considering the subject. I trust a bill

to exempt farmers from payment of this tax on gasoline purchased for nonhighway use will be approved by the committee in the very near future, and will be passed by a resounding majority.

### The Merchant Marine

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANCIS E. DORN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Recently all New York City newspapers gave prominence to a roundup story showing that a total of 132 big ships had made their maiden visit to the world's largest port during 1955.

New York is my home port, and port officials there were greatly gratified to learn that such a great flotilla of fine vessels had passed the Statue of Liberty for the first time and docked at the city's piers carrying passengers and cargo from all over the world. It was good news, indeed, for everyone except those of us in Congress who hold the interests of the American merchant marine to be one of our paramount considerations.

As a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I read these stories with keen disappointment. For, out of the grand total of 132 ships making their initial visit to New York, only 6 flew the American flag. Twenty-two times that number carried foreign flags. This is distressing news, indeed, for anyone holding the firm conviction that the American merchant marine is not only vital to our whole economy, but to our very security as a Nation.

The American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars at their last annual conventions again emphatically stressed the necessity of a strong American merchant marine as a vital defense factor. These veterans' organizations realize, probably more deeply than anyone else, the hard fact that it was the American merchant marine that made it possible to fight and win two great World Wars on the enemy's territory instead of fighting it out here on our own. It was this offensive defensive which paid off so brilliantly, and it was our own merchant marine which made it possible.

But the figures I have cited on new-vessel arrivals in my own home port are a dramatic warning. We are letting our merchant marine, the most powerful defense corollary of our Armed Forces, decline. It will decline even more rapidly unless Congress meets head-on a new threat whose ominous proportions at last are made clear. I speak of the oncoming attempt by foreign-flag steamship lines, with the direct assistance of their governments, to break down the historic 50-50 law whereby American ships are carrying half of the relief cargoes we are sending to those very countries. These cargoes are financed by the American taxpayer. Because of this, you would naturally think that our foreign marine competitors would



accept the fair and just principle that Americans just be given an even break with their own. But no. Apparently they want to transport it all. If this strikes a paralyzing blow at our merchant marine, well, so what?

The exposure of this calculated plot was fully revealed just the other day by Francis T. Greene, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute. Appearing before the National Security Commission of the American Legion here in Washington on January 18, Mr. Green charged that there is a collective conspiracy by powerful foreign steamship groups to pressure Congress into emasculating one of its laws, "to the detriment of our national security and the security of the free world."

President Greene told the Legion Security Commission that the law the foreign shipping interests sought to break down is the statute which the Legion has strongly supported for years, guaranteeing that 50 percent of the cargoes for foreign relief and paid for by American taxpayers, must be carried in American ships.

It is due largely to the vision and support of the Legion that Congress each year has assured the American people that their own merchant marine shall be used to transport a fair half of these cargoes—

Mr. Greene said.

The hope of this conspiracy by foreign steamship lines is to mislead the American farmer and the American people into the belief that the fair and equitable 50-50 law is blocking surplus agricultural disposal—

The shipping official told the Legion. He continued:

Thus, the foreign shipping associates, by arousing the fears of American agriculture, hope to ride on the back of the American farmer and tear down the 50-50 law. These foreign shipping lobbies could never do this by themselves.

Mr. Greene charged that as early as September 1954, the principal European maritime nations represented by the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, made the pointed suggestion that their member countries, rather than abide by the 50-50 provision in American law, might prefer to take care of their agricultural requirements elsewhere.

The American shipping official cited an impressive list of collusive incidents by Scandinavian shipowners' associations in refusing to buy American agricultural products where the 50-50 law applies.

This documented record proves that the Western European shipping associations have induced their governments to raise the 50-50 issue in their own self-interest in order to put pressure on the American farmer to put pressure on our Congress to remove this essential safeguard for our own merchant marine—

Mr. Greene added.

All these attacks by foreign shipping interests on American laws violate a basic tenet of American Legion policy, which supports a strong American merchant marine as being vital to our security as a nation—

Mr. Greene testified.

The authoritative Defense Department estimate is that this country should have not

fewer than 1,085 ships in the dry-cargo category alone—

Mr. Greene said.

This is greater than our entire private merchant marine today, tankers included.

Another factor impairing the efficiency of the American merchant marine as a defense auxiliary is the direct competition of the Military Sea Transportation Service with our commercial passenger fleet, Mr. Green said.

Currently, MSTS is operating 47 Government-owned passenger ships, as against 39 privately-operated liners. While this direct competition is destructive, the paramount issue is the retention of the 50-50 principle. Its emasculation or abandonment would put American exporters in general, and American farmers in particular, at the mercy of discriminatory foreign-flag rates. All Americans who produce any commodity for export need the assurance of reliable ocean transport. This can be given only by a merchant marine under American control. It is my sincere conviction that elimination of 50-50 from Government-financed sales of Government surpluses, or from any other category of public cargo to which it now applies, would, in the long run, be no less a disaster for American agriculture and industry than for American shipping, which it would severely cripple, or for our national security, which it would dangerously jeopardize.

Edward Bacon Wilber

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am certain many Members feel, as I do, a deep sense of loss in the passing of Edward Bacon Wilber, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Administration and budget officer of the State Department.

Many of us knew Ed personally. All of us admired him for his integrity, ability, and patience. We trusted his discretion and tact. I am confident that this feeling was shared by members of both parties. It was the feeling all of us have for a truly outstanding public servant.

Edward Bacon Wilber was born in Fairport, N. Y., and graduated from Union College in 1925. He was a widely respected management consultant before he joined the Government in 1941. In addition to his work in the Department of State, he served the Bureau of the Budget for 7 years and was a consultant to the Hoover Commission.

In 1951, to show its appreciation for Mr. Wilber's unswerving devotion to our country and his outstanding accomplishments for good government, the other body adopted a resolution directing that he should "receive a salary commensurate with the service he renders to the Government as an outstanding employee of the Department of State."

Those of us whose duties required inspection trips abroad have had the pleasure of traveling with Mr. Wilber on various occasions. We profited by his

extensive knowledge of State Department operations abroad, his ability to analyze the difficult problems encountered in such work, and his sincerity and energy in everything that he undertook.

I know that many Members join me in sincere condolences to Mrs. Wilber and the children, Edward, Jr., Paul and Marcia Jeanne. While there is little that we can do to ease the burden of their grief, I hope it may help them to know of the high regard in which Edward Bacon Wilber was held by all who know him in his Government career.

Remarks of Senator James H. Duff, Republican, of Pennsylvania, at Conference of Jewish Organizations, January 18, 1956, Shoreham Hotel, Washington D. C.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

It can no longer be gainsaid that the darkening clouds in the Near East are the early portents of a storm that could burst in that area with completely devastating violence.

There is every evidence that the Communists have concluded that the Near East is the soft spot that now presents the most promising opportunities for exploitation in the characteristic Communist way.

In determining how to deal with this critical situation, it is important to bear in mind that in the years intervening since the end of World War II the Communists, by methods similar to those now being employed in the Near East, have brought under their domination seven hundred million peoples and one-quarter of the whole surface of the earth, and with this, enormous material resources, including those vital to supplement the particular deficiencies which the Communist world has so far suffered from the lack of. The implication of the successful continuation of such methods is too clear to require elaboration.

It is of no avail at this late hour to cry over past spilt milk. But possibly a realization of how that milk was spilt may be instructive in dealing with the present constantly mounting crisis. Failure to act in 1949, when Israel had won a decisive victory against the Arab States, has resulted, as such delay always does, in making infinitely more difficult the resolution of the problem.

At that time, had treaties been definitized and a *modus operandi* established, there would have been no crisis today.

As might reasonably have been expected, the Communists have shifted from one tack to another in dealing with this situation, studied to create confusion, and done everything in their power to prevent a peaceful and fair solution of the difficulties in that area.

Hardly a day passes without some new move by the Communists to keep the whole situation upset and to make it increasingly difficult to deal with. Only today a dispatch out of London indicates that Czechoslovakia has offered cheap Communist arms to Afghanistan, an immensely important spot on



the flank of the Baghdad Pact Defense Alliance. Other moves of the same character can with assurance be expected. All of which indicates that this vitally critical area to the free world has been selected by the Communists for the embarrassment of the West and the continuous further march of the communistic infiltration and expansion.

This complicated and aggravated situation in the Near East, especially between Israel and Egypt, poses the greatest possible threat to world peace. Too little and too late is a sure invitation to Communist aggression as was proven both in Korea and in Indo-China.

Formosa is not the only place where it was necessary for the free world to draw a line and say: "No further."

It was always the dream of Imperialist Russia under the czars to extend the domain of Russia eastward to the Pacific—a dream realized under the Communists. It was as well the dream of Imperialist Russia to extend their domain from the Mediterranean and the Dardanelles eastward to the Persian Gulf. There is every reason to believe that the intention of the Communists to realize this second ambition is as definite as was the first. There can be no doubt that the free world cannot possibly permit this expansion to be realized. And yet the Israel-Arab dispute is on the very doorstep of that expansion.

Consequently it would seem that it was in the enlightened self-interest of the free world to put a period to this expansion now before it expands beyond control so as to threaten the peace of the world.

The policy of the United States is to wage peace, not war. The policy of the Communists is to wage war, and not peace. The sure way to play into their hands, to make it easier for them to gain their ends, is to vacillate at a time when decisive action is necessary and it seems to me that this is the time for decisive action in the Near East. Certainly that problem will not be settled in the United Nations. It will not be settled at all except by the definite and united action of the United States, Britain, and France. That was true in 1949. It is true today. It will continue to be true until the situation develops into a crisis that may be unresolvable except by conflict. That conflict must be prevented.

Speaking as an individual, the only practical solution for this problem is for the free world to guarantee the existing borders between the disputants, to offset arms to Egypt by arms to Israel—not to encourage an arms race but to maintain a proper balance between them.

Vacillation can only result in ultimate disaster. Decisive action now is the answer.

To the answer that this is dangerous procedure, the reply is: Of course, it is dangerous. Everything is dangerous unless the Communists are permitted to have their own free way. To guarantee these boundaries at this time instead of allowing the Communist infiltration and expansion might very well be the means of preventing another local war of enormous strategic importance where ultimately we would be compelled to interfere. Therefore, the risk would be no greater now than later and it very reasonably might be expected to stabilize a situation that would otherwise be completely out of hand.

By the very nature of current events, it must be clear that we are living in a tremendously dangerous and explosive world. And it will continue to be dangerous and explosive until the Communists are made to understand unmistakably that the time has come when we will act and not talk when they continue in a course that unimpeded can lead to disaster both to us and free people everywhere.

In conclusion, the time has come when we've got to say to the Communists: "You've got to stop this and you've got to stop it now."

### Fifth Anniversary of Imprisonment of Archbishop Beran

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. KENNETH B. KEATING**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the one thing above all else the Communists fear is the spread of truth behind the Iron Curtain. Their entire system is based upon the suppression of information from the outside world and stifling of opinion and thought within their tyrannical empire.

Recognition of this situation makes it doubly important that we pause today to consider that next Saturday marks the 5th anniversary of the imprisonment by the Communists of Archbishop Joseph Beran, Archbishop of Prague.

Archbishop Beran is one of the great churchmen of Europe, widely loved within and without the Catholic Church. Even in absentia, his spirit is a strong factor in the will of his countrymen to be free. He stands today—wherever he may be—as a symbol to the people of Czechoslovakia of their desire to rid themselves of the infamous Soviet rule which has temporarily rubbed out their proud heritage of liberty and freedom.

The Archbishop of Prague is but one of many noble men who have lost their freedom in service to their church in recent years. Cardinal Tien in China, Cardinal Wyszyński in Poland, Cardinal Stepinac in Yugoslavia, and Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary are others who have suffered cruel imprisonment under the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, the free world, by its stony silence, is sealing the fate of Archbishop Beran and his gallant churchmen. Does the fact that these innocent men are still suffering amidst the apathy of the rest of the world mean that we have given them up for lost? Does it mean that we are insensible to the crimes which have been perpetrated against them?

No, Mr. Speaker; we have not forgotten them. But we must intensify our efforts to set them free. Through the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe we must demand an end to the terror behind the Iron Curtain. By raising our voices in protest, we not only bring hope to those imprisoned under Soviet rule, but we also make sure that the entire world is informed of the true facts of religious persecution in the lands where the Red hordes have taken over.

As we pause today in sober commemoration of Archbishop Beran's tragic removal from Prague, let us reaffirm our opposition to the godless evil which has brought so much misery and suffering upon the world. We in the United States, as the world's great disciples of freedom, cannot in good conscience continue to pursue our present disinterested course. We must renew our demands that Archbishop Beran and others who are suffering a similar fate are given the freedom to which all men are entitled.

### Psychiatric and Narcotic Hospitals a Federal-State Partnership

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak today in support of my bill H. R. 7838, which I introduced in the first session of this Congress. This bill would amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to provide grants of Federal aid to States for surveying and meeting the needs for psychiatric hospitals and auxiliary facilities and for narcotics hospitals and auxiliary facilities. There can be little doubt as to the crying need for action in these areas of concern for public health.

Nor can there be any doubt that under the provisions of the so-called Hill-Burton Act great strides forward have been made to alleviate the painful shortage of general hospital facilities. From January 1948 through September 1955, 126,740 general hospital beds have been provided or are in process under the provisions of the 1946 act. The emphasis in the past has been, however, on general hospital facilities, and the time has now come for specific attention to be given to two of our Nation's major health problems: mental illness and narcotic addiction. Both of these phases of our Nation's health have been all but neglected in the administration of the Hill-Burton Act, and it is only through a specific allocation of funds for these purposes that significant steps can and will be taken to improve the present situation.

In the field of mental illness, it has been estimated recently that 9 to 10 million Americans, 1 of every 16, are suffering from some mental or emotional disorder. On any given day, 750,000 are mentally ill in a hospital bed. In addition, some 400,000 persons suffering from mental illness should be in mental hospitals. The remaining millions, though not requiring hospitalization, are seriously handicapped in their ability to work and lead normal family and civic lives.

The fact remains clear that existing facilities are nowhere near adequate to handle the present burden. In some States, persons legally committed to mental hospitals have to wait months, sometimes years, before they can be placed. In some cases, these mentally ill persons spend this waiting period in jails, often ruining any chance they might have had for recovery.

The hospitals are extremely overcrowded. Two out of every four State mental hospitals are handling a patient load greater than their intended capacity. The need for additional hospital beds has been estimated at between 330,000 and 500,000, but even the lowest figure is a huge one. Congress, having recognized its function in the construction of general hospitals, should now provide specific aid to the States to ease



the critical shortage which now exists in the field of mental care. We must recognize the need to aid States which cannot provide or have not provided adequate facilities to care for their mentally ill.

In addition, my bill provides for surveying the needs and constructing badly needed psychiatric rehabilitation facilities. More than 200,000 persons a year are being treated at these clinics and they too are greatly overcrowded. It has been estimated that to fulfill the requirements for outpatient psychiatric services, an additional 800 centers are needed.

The effectiveness of psychiatric clinics and rehabilitation centers has already been well established. Psychiatric techniques have so advanced in recent years, that authorities in the field have estimated that as many as one-third of the patients being treated successfully in clinics would, several years ago, have been regarded as suitable only for more costly hospital treatment.

These facilities are used not only for cases which are of a less serious nature, but also function as diagnostic centers, spotting incipient mental disease and recommending treatment before it becomes drastically disabling. Furthermore, clinics provide follow-up aid for patients who have been released from mental hospitals.

We know that readmission rates to mental hospitals are very high. Although there are no adequate statistics for the total picture, studies have indicated that in my own State of New York, for example, one-third of all mental hospital entrants have been in these hospitals at least once previously. The follow-up treatment given at psychiatric clinics may well cut into this readmission rate substantially. Thus, establishment of such clinics would represent a saving in money and in human resources.

In the area of treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts virtually nothing has been done under the Hill-Burton Act, and every day the scourge of narcotic addiction increases. My bill is designed to allocate funds for the specific purposes of surveying the need for narcotic hospitals and narcotic rehabilitation facilities, as well as for their construction. The narcotic problem merits the considered attention of the Congress.

At the present time, the Narcotics Bureau estimates that there are 60,000 addicts in our population; that is, 1 of every 3,000 persons. This represents an increase of 10,000 to 15,000 addicts since 1948, an increase which is frightening since the trend indicates that since the end of the war there has been an increase of narcotic use among our juveniles. In 1948, for example, approximately 3 percent of all addicts admitted to the Lexington Narcotics Hospital were under the age of 21 years and, in 1955, the figure rose to approximately 7 percent. Some form of aid must be given to help these young persons.

In addition to the problems caused by the use of narcotics by these minors, there is the testimony of many authorities that addicts, to support their habit, must resort to crime. It has been pre-

viously estimated that as much as 50 percent of the crime in our major cities today is perpetrated by drug addicts.

Commissioner Anslinger has stated that 11.8 percent of the total Federal prison population in this Nation are persons convicted of violations of the Federal narcotics and marihuana laws. He further cited a city in this Nation where there was heavy traffic in narcotics and a 600 percent increase in the number of housebreakings, armed robberies, and larceny. The Commissioner reported that when narcotics agents cracked down on the drug traffic, the crime rate dropped to its normal level.

The tragedy of the situation is simple: All efforts have been and are being directed at the flow of narcotics to the user, and few forward strides have been made in the cure of the addict who is captured or voluntarily comes forward for cure.

It is generally recognized that it is impossible to defeat addiction outside of institutions specifically and specially staffed and equipped to effect a proper cure. At the present time, there are only two hospitals in the United States specifically equipped to supply a comprehensive treatment to addicts. They are the Federal institutions at Lexington and Fort Worth. The combined facilities of these 2 hospitals is a mere 2,340 beds, a pitifully inadequate figure. There is a waiting list at present of over 500 applicants.

The shortage of facilities must be overcome. To do the job intelligently, however, it is necessary first to determine the specific needs of specific localities. For this purpose, my bill authorizes that funds be appropriated for a survey to inventory existing facilities for the diagnosis, treatment, and care of addicts, to determine the need for construction of facilities for such diagnosis, treatment, and care, and to develop programs for the construction of such facilities.

Perhaps the most important feature of my bill is its concern with the construction of rehabilitation facilities to aid users of narcotics who are not as yet addicted, to counsel addicts to prepare them to accept the benefits to be derived from hospitalization, and, finally, to provide aftercare to addicts who have been released from narcotics hospitals so that they may once again take their place in society.

This latter phase is one which is receiving growing recognition. Commissioner Anslinger recently testified before the subcommittee investigating this problem that "aftercare is probably one of the most promising phases of rehabilitation." Aftercare in clinics would help the addict adjust psychologically to withdrawal of drugs after he had been relieved of physiological dependence on them.

Too many addicts, who have been treated at the hospitals, return to the same environment from which they came and, unable to find work, or acceptance by a new social group, they return to their addiction. This is considered a strong factor in the large proportion of addicts, estimated at 85 percent, who return to their addiction after

release from the Federal narcotics hospitals.

With clinics and rehabilitation centers which could provide psychological counseling, and which could mobilize community employment and recreation resources, we might be able not only to cure the addict, but to keep him cured. Only a small number of such rehabilitation centers exist. They are of recent origin and are located in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. Although they are able to handle only a small number of cases, their indicated progress is heartening. I feel that Congress should provide aid to the States in establishing more of such facilities.

I wish also to report, Mr. Speaker, that I have requested the opinions of State public-health officials, and of public-health groups throughout the Nation on the bill I have introduced. The response has been exceptionally gratifying, not only in terms of the number of replies, but much more important, in terms of the enthusiasm displayed for the legislation. I shall present all of these communications to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when hearings are held on the bill.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that this bill, H. R. 7838, represents an application of a well-established principle, Federal aid to State health activities, in two crucial areas of national concern. I hope that consideration of the magnitude of the mental health and narcotic addiction problems will cause the legislature to pass this bill.

## Markings on Social Security Checks Sent Through the Mails

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives that would amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that benefit checks and certain related materials sent through the mails shall not bear any markings which would reveal the nature of the recipient's entitlement or disentitlement to benefits under the act, such as, for example, unmarried widow.

My bill would provide that no check drawn in payment of any benefit under title II of the SSA, and no envelope or other outer covering for any such check, or for any other statement or document relating to an individual's eligibility for any such benefit, which is sent through the mails, shall bear any markings or devices which might disclose any information with respect to such individual's status under title II, or to the nature of his or her entitlement or disentitlement to benefits under title II.

Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous complaints from constituents on this problem.



After all, communications between the department of social security and an individual should not be for the information of outsiders; it sometimes causes needless personal embarrassment.

### The Late Dr. Will W. Alexander

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ord, I should like to express my regret in the passing of Dr. Will W. Alexander, who died from a heart ailment in my home town of Chapel Hill last Friday.

Dr. Alexander had been in failing health for the past 4 months but until recently he carried on his duties with the Rosenwald Foundation.

Will Alexander lived a full and rewarding life and served in many posts of distinction in his long public career. Ordained as a minister, he served churches in Tennessee before leaving the ministry to become executive director of the Commission on Inter-racial Cooperation in Atlanta. He was president of 1 college and trustee of 5 colleges. An assistant director of the United States Resettlement Administration and vice president of the Rosenwald Foundation, he labored faithfully to improve

living conditions for many groups, particularly in the South. Under the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Dr. Alexander served as Director of the Farm Security Administration.

Known nationally as a race relations authority, Dr. Alexander was awarded in 1928 the Harmon award for service in American race relations.

On retirement, Dr. Alexander moved to Durham County in my district, and bought a farm. He had many friends and admirers in the university community of Chapel Hill, and his counsel and advice were often sought. He will be greatly missed throughout the South and the Nation, and I am sure many Members of the House who knew him and know of his work and influence will regret the ending of a useful life devoted to the public good.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, January 16, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who hast ordained that in trial we shall find our strength and that our faith must stand the test of fire: Give us this day a sense of Thy nearness; take Thou the dimness of our souls away.

In these turbulent days be Thou our strength and shield. Make those here, by the people trusted with the very life of the Nation, to be truly the ministering servants of Thy will and purpose in the temple of patriotism pure and undefiled. Forbid that for any partisan advantage the precious oil of national unity be spilled upon the ground to ignite selfish fires. May it rather still feed the flame of liberty's torch as it enlightens the whole world. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 19, 1956, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to request the Secretary of State to arrange for the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, to conduct a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 5649) to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5649) to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of routine business, and that any statement made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military

installations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN DEBTS DUE THE UNITED STATES BY INDIVIDUALS AND TRIBES OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of November 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY STATE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by the Department of State, during the calendar year 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Knights of Columbus—Our Lady of Fatima General Assembly, Fourth Degree (Patriotic), Suffolk County, N. Y., relating to a revision of the Status of Forces Agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.